

From: Arnold Whitridge
Sent: Wednesday, October 15, 2003 10:23 AM
To: Dabbs, Paul
Subject: Regional summaries comments

Comments on Regional Summaries in Stakeholder Briefing Draft
Arnold Whitridge 10-14-03

South Lahontan and Colorado River: It's confusing at best to have completed water balance summaries for these regions that don't show a line for "exports to other regions", particularly when the accompanying maps suggest that such exports do take place.

North Coast: I recommend discussion in State of the Region of the Eel-to-Russian diversion, since resolution of this ongoing controversy will affect management decisions and fish populations in two of the largest watersheds in the region. The topic is one of general interest and significance, and is treated in the DWR Water News on occasion.

The Trinity River information in State of the Region (second to last paragraph) is still not quite right. The instream flows prescribed by the 2000 ROD for dry, normal, and wet years are not in a different scientific or legal status than those for critically dry or extremely wet years, and the result of the 2000 decision may sometime be "an increase in fishery habitat and a decrease in water supply available to the Sacramento River", but this hasn't really happened yet, since the prescribed flows have been capped by an injunction at dry year levels. An appeal of the injunction is pending before the 9th Circuit, and a supplemental EIS/EIR is being prepared which when completed could result in a lifting of the injunction. One laconic approach to improving the paragraph:

A significant change in use of the Region's water was approved by the Secretary of the Interior in December, 2000, with a decision to increase Trinity River instream flows from 340,000 acre-feet per year (roughly one quarter of average annual flow at the CVP diversion point on the Trinity) to an average of 595,000 acre-feet per year as part of an effort to restore Trinity River fisheries. This decision, which would reduce the amount of water available for export from the Trinity River to the Central Valley, is the subject of litigation, and implementation of the new flow regime has been stayed by an injunction pending completion of a Supplemental EIS, scheduled for mid-2004.

The second paragraph in Looking to the Future is mysterious, as no clue is offered as to which tributary of the Trinity River is being discussed. If the paragraph is kept, I recommend changing the first sentence so that it begins "Sediment delivery from Grass Valley Creek to the Trinity River has been greatly reduced...". However, the paragraph seems more appropriate for State of the Region than for Looking to the Future, and if the intent is to describe Trinity River Restoration efforts the paragraph is misleading, because it discusses only one of

several restoration components, and not one which is currently at the forefront. I would either delete the paragraph or expand it to present a more complete discussion of the Trinity River Restoration Program.

Again I urge DWR to obtain up-to-date Trinity River information; I have recommended one authoritative source that I believe would be helpful at no charge, and I can suggest others if desired. In general, it seems inappropriate and ineffective to attempt to create the summary before the long version.